

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated December 29, 2006, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of objection and rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicant adds claims 9-11. Therefore, claims 1-11 are now pending in the application.

**I. Objections to the Specification**

The specification is objected to because the Examiner maintains that the specification does not have proper section headings. In addition, the Examiner alleges that the current title is not descriptive.

Applicant hereby amends the specification to modify the title and add headings. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the objections.

**II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunzinger *et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0172192, hereinafter “Hunzinger”) in view of Parantainen *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,092373, hereinafter “Parantainen”). Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections as follows.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits the combination of Hunzinger and Parantainen fails to teach or suggest each feature of the claim. For example, neither Hunzinger nor Parantainen teaches or suggests that in a transfer mode corresponding to the highest bit rates, acknowledgment information is sent in the non-acknowledged mode from a radio link control receiver to a radio link control sender, as recited in claim 1.

Hunzinger relates to a method and apparatus for controlling the maximum number of re-transmissions of an information packet that may be attempted if the information packet was not properly received. By assigning multiple maximum allowable retransmission (MAR) values over a range of possible data rates, an efficient distribution of MAR values can be assigned to the range of possible data rates to minimize the overall latency of the communication link. See Abstract. In addition, across a range of possible data rates, different acknowledgement delays (time for sending an acknowledgement message (ACK) or a non-acknowledgement message (NAK) after receiving a frame/slot/packet) may be assigned. Finally, different number of ARQ channels need to send ACK or NAK messages and different frame sizes may also be assigned across a range of possible data rates. See Hunzinger at paragraph [0109].

Hunzinger merely discloses that an ACK or a NAK message after receiving a frame/slot/packet can be delayed for different lengths of time across a range of possible data rates. In other words, the ACK message in Hunzinger might be delayed for a longer or shorter time depending on the data rate. Hunzinger, however, does not teach or suggest that in a transfer mode corresponding to the highest bit rates, an ACK message is sent in a non-acknowledged mode.

Furthermore, Parantainen, which relates to a method for signaling using more than one connection and time slot for packet data transfer in one data transfer direction, and asymmetric resources for uplink/downlink data transfer, fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Hunzinger.

Therefore, claim 1 should be patentable at least for the foregoing reasons. Claims 2, 4 and 6-8 should be patentable at least because of their dependency on claim 1.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunzinger in view of Parantainen and Puharinen (8309700 Advanced Topics in Telecommunications, hereinafter “Puharinen”).

Claim 3 should be patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 1, and because Puharinen fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Hunzinger and Parantainen with respect to claim 1.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunzinger in view of Parantainen and Balachandran *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,375, hereinafter “Balachandran”).

Claim 5 should be patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 1, and because Balachandran fails to cure the noted deficiencies of Hunzinger and Parantainen with respect to claim 1.

### **III. New Claims**

Claims 9-11 are added to further define the claimed invention.

Claim 9 should be patentable at least because of its dependency from claim 1. Moreover, the cited references do not teach or suggest “non-acknowledged mode is General Packet Radio Service (GPRS) mode or Temporary Block Flow (TBF) mode” as recited by claim 9.

Claims 10 and 11 should be patentable at least because the cited references do not teach or suggest a mean for, in a transfer mode corresponding to Enhanced General Packet Radio Service (EGPRS), taking into account SSN and RRB information transmitted in a non-acknowledged mode, as recited in those claims.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp  
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 29, 2007